arXiv:1608.04859v1 [math.OA] 17 Aug 2016

Imprimitivity bimodules of Cuntz–Krieger algebras and strong shift equivalences of matrices

Kengo Matsumoto
Department of Mathematics
Joetsu University of Education
Joetsu, 943-8512, Japan

Abstract

In this paper, we will introduce a notion of basis related Morita equivalence in the Cuntz–Krieger algebras $(\mathcal{O}_A, \{S_a\}_{a\in E_A})$ with the canonical right finite basis $\{S_a\}_{a\in E_A}$ as Hilbert C^*-bimodule, and prove that two nonnegative irreducible matrices A and B are elementary equivalent, that is, $A = CD, B = DC$ for some nonnegative rectangular matrices C, D, if and only if the Cuntz–Krieger algebras $(\mathcal{O}_A, \{S_a\}_{a\in E_A})$ and $(\mathcal{O}_B, \{S_b\}_{b\in E_B})$ with the canonical right finite bases are basis relatedly elementary Morita equivalent.

1 Introduction

Let $A = [A(i,j)]_{i,j=1}^N$ be an irreducible matrix with entries in nonnegative integers, that is simply called a nonnegative matrix. We assume that A is not any permutation matrix. Let $G_A = (V_A, E_A)$ be a finite directed graph with N vertices $V_A = \{v_1^A, \dots, v_N^A\}$ and with $A(i,j)$ directed edges whose source vertices are v_i and terminal vertices are v_j. For a directed edge e, we denote by $s(e)$ the source vertex of e and by $t(e)$ the terminal vertex of e. Let $E_A = \{a_1, \dots, a_{N_A}\}$ be the edge set of the graph G_A. The two-sided topological Markov shift $(\bar{X}_A, \bar{\sigma}_A)$ associated with A is defined as a topological dynamical system of the compact Hausdorff space $\bar{X}_A$ of all biinfinte sequences $(a_i)_{i\in\mathbb{Z}} \in E_A^{\mathbb{Z}}$ of edges a_i of G_A such that $t(a_i) = s(a_{i+1})$ for all $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ with shift transformation $\bar{\sigma}_A$ defined by $\bar{\sigma}_A((a_i)_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}) = (a_{i+1})_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}$. R. F. Williams in [24] proved a fundamental classification result for the topological Markov shifts which says that the topological Markov shifts $(\bar{X}_A, \bar{\sigma}_A)$ and $(\bar{X}_B, \bar{\sigma}_B)$ are topologically conjugate if and only if the matrices A and B are strong shift equivalent. Two nonnegative square matrices M and N are said to be elementary equivalent, or strong shift equivalent in 1-step, if there exist nonnegative rectangular matrices R, S such that $M = RS, N = SR$. If there exists a finite sequence of nonnegative matrices $A_1, A_2, \dots, A_k$ such that $A = A_1, B = A_k$ and A_i are elementary equivalent to A_{i+1} for $i = 1, 2, \dots, k-1$, then A and B are said to be strong shift equivalent.

In [6], Cuntz–Krieger introduced and studied a class of C^*-algebras associated to topological Markov shifts. They are well-known and called the Cuntz–Krieger algebras. There is a standard method to associate a Cuntz–Krieger algebra from a square matrix with entries in nonnegative integers as described in [21, Section 4]. For a nonnegative matrix $A = [A(i,j)]_{i,j=1}^N$, the associated directed graph $G_A = (V_A, E_A)$ with the edge set

$E_A = \{a_1, \dots, a_{N^A}\}$ has the $N_A \times N_A$ transition matrix $A^G = [A^G(a_i, a_j)]_{i,j=1}^{N_A}$ of edges defined by

$$A^G(a_i, a_j) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } t(a_i) = s(a_j), \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

for $a_i, a_j \in E_A$. The Cuntz–Krieger algebra $\mathcal{O}_A$ for the matrix A with entries in nonnegative integers is defined as the Cuntz–Krieger algebra $\mathcal{O}_{A^G}$ for the matrix A^G which is the universal C^*-algebra generated by partial isometries S_{a_i} indexed by edges $a_i, i = 1, \dots, N_A$ subject to the relations:

$$\sum_{j=1}^{N_A} S_{a_j} S_{a_j}^* = 1, \qquad S_{a_i}^* S_{a_i} = \sum_{j=1}^{N_A} A^G(a_i, a_j) S_{a_j} S_{a_j}^* \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, N_A. \tag{1.2}$$

Since we are assuming that the matrix A is irreducible and not any permutation, the algebra $\mathcal{O}_A$ is uniquely determined by the relation (1.2), and becomes simple and purely infinite ([6]). For a word $\mu = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_k), \mu_i \in E_A$, we denote by S_μ the partial isometry $S_{\mu_1} \cdots S_{\mu_k}$. For $t \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} = \mathbb{T}$, the correspondence $S_{a_i} \to e^{2\pi\sqrt{-1}t} S_{a_i}$, $i = 1, \dots, N_A$ gives rise to an automorphism of $\mathcal{O}_A$ denoted by ρ_t^A. The automorphisms $\rho_t^A, t \in \mathbb{T}$ yield an action of $\mathbb{T}$ on $\mathcal{O}_A$ called the gauge action. Let us denote by $\mathcal{D}_A$ the C^*-subalgebra of $\mathcal{O}_A$ generated by the projections of the form: $S_{a_{i_1}} \cdots S_{a_{i_n}} S_{a_{i_n}}^* \cdots S_{a_{i_1}}^*, i_1, \dots, i_n = 1, \dots, N_A$. Let $\mathcal{K}$ be the C^*-algebra of all compact operators on a separable infinite dimensional Hilbert space. Cuntz and Krieger proved that if two topological Markov shifts $(\bar{X}_A, \bar{\sigma}_A)$ and $(\bar{X}_B, \bar{\sigma}_B)$ are topologically conjugate, the gauge actions ρ^A and ρ^B of the Cuntz-Krieger algebras $\mathcal{O}_A$ and $\mathcal{O}_B$ are stably conjugate. That is, there exists an isomorphism φ from $\mathcal{O}_A \otimes \mathcal{K}$ to $\mathcal{O}_B \otimes \mathcal{K}$ such that $\varphi \circ (\rho_t^A \otimes \mathrm{id}) = (\rho_t^B \otimes \mathrm{id}) \circ \varphi$, $t \in \mathbb{T}$ ([6, 3.8. Theorem], cf. [5]). As a corollary of this result, we know that if two nonnegative irreducible matrices A and B are strong shift equivalent, the stabilized Cuntz–Krieger algebras $\mathcal{O}_A \otimes \mathcal{K}$ and $\mathcal{O}_B \otimes \mathcal{K}$ are isomorphic. On the other hand, M. Rieffel in [19] has introduced the notion of strong Morita equivalence in C^*-algebras from the view point of representation theory. Two C^*-algebras $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ are said to be strongly Morita equivalent if there exists an $\mathcal{A}$–$\mathcal{B}$-imprimitivity bimodule. By Brown–Green–Rieffel theorem [2, Theorem 1.2], two unital C^*-algebras $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ are strongly Morita equivalent if and only if their stabilizations $\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{K}$ and $\mathcal{B} \otimes \mathcal{K}$ are isomorphic (cf. [1], [2], [3]). From this view point, the author has recently introduced a notion of strongly Morita equivalent for the triplets $(\mathcal{O}_A, \mathcal{D}_A, \rho^A)$ called the Cuntz–Krieger triplet, and proved that $(\mathcal{O}_A, \mathcal{D}_A, \rho^A)$ and $(\mathcal{O}_B, \mathcal{D}_B, \rho^B)$ are strongly Morita equivalent if and only if A and B are strong shift equivalent ([15]). We note that Morita equivalence of C^*-algebras from view points of strong shift equivalence of matrices had been studied in [12], [13], [16], [22], etc.

Y. Watatani in [23] has introduced the notion of finite basis of Hilbert C^*-module. In this paper, inspired by his definition of finite basis, we we will introduce a notion of *basis relatedly Morita equivalence* in the Cuntz–Krieger algebras $(\mathcal{O}_A, \{S_a\}_{a \in E_A})$ with the canonical right finite basis $\{S_a\}_{a \in E_A}$ of the generating partial isometries satisfying (1.2) as Hilbert C^*-bimodule. For nonnegative irreducible matrices A and B, the Cuntz–Krieger algebras $(\mathcal{O}_A, \{S_a\}_{a \in E_A})$ and $(\mathcal{O}_B, \{S_b\}_{b \in E_B})$ with their respect canonical right finite bases $\{S_a\}_{a \in E_A}$ and $\{S_b\}_{b \in E_B}$ are said to be *basis relatedly elementary Morita equivalent* if there exists an $\mathcal{O}_A$–$\mathcal{O}_B$-implimitivity bimodule ${}_AX_B$ with a right finite basis $\{\eta_c\}_{c \in \mathcal{E}_C}$ and a left

finite basis $\{\zeta_d\}_{d\in\mathcal{E}_D}$ that are finitely related such that the relative tensor products between ${}_AX_B$ and its conjugate $\overline{{}_AX_B}$ are isomorphic to $\mathcal{O}_A$ and $\mathcal{O}_B$, respectively:

$$\mathcal{O}_A \cong {}_AX_B \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_B} \overline{{}_AX_B}, \qquad \mathcal{O}_B \cong \overline{{}_AX_B} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_A} {}_AX_B \tag{1.3}$$

as Hilbert C^*-bimodule with respect to their canonical right finite bases. If $(\mathcal{O}_A, \{S_a\}_{a\in E_A})$ and $(\mathcal{O}_B, \{S_b\}_{b\in E_B})$ are connected by a finite sequence of basis related elementary Morita equivalences, then they are said to be *basis relatedly Morita equivalent*. We will prove the following theorem.

Theorem 1.1 (Theorem 3.12)**.** *Let A, B be nonnegative irreducible matrices that are not any permutations. Then A and B are elementary equivalent, that is, $A = CD, B = DC$ for some nonnegative rectangular matrices C, D, if and only if the Cuntz–Krieger algebras $(\mathcal{O}_A, \{S_a\}_{a\in E_A})$ and $(\mathcal{O}_B, \{S_b\}_{b\in E_B})$ with the canonical right finite bases are basis relatedly elementary Morita equivalent.*

Thanks to the Williams' classification theorem, we have the following corollary.

Corollary 1.2 (Corollary 3.13, [15])**.** *Let A, B be nonnegative irreducible matrices that are not any permutations. Then the following three assertions are equivalent.*

(i) *The two-sided topological Markov shifts $(\bar{X}_A, \bar{\sigma}_A)$ and $(\bar{X}_B, \bar{\sigma}_B)$ are topologically conjugate.*

(ii) *The Cuntz–Krieger algebras $(\mathcal{O}_A, \{S_a\}_{a\in E_A})$ and $(\mathcal{O}_B, \{S_b\}_{b\in E_B})$ with the canonical right finite bases are basis relatedly Morita equivalent.*

(iii) *The Cuntz–Krieger triplets $(\mathcal{O}_A, \mathcal{D}_A, \rho^A)$ and $(\mathcal{O}_B, \mathcal{D}_B, \rho^B)$ are strongly Morita equivalent in the sense of [15].*

2 Basis related Morita equivalence

Let $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ be C^*-algebras. Let us first recall the definition of Hilbert C^*-module introduced by Paschke [17] (cf. [19], [9], [8], etc.). A left Hilbert C^*-module ${}_{\mathcal{A}}X$ over $\mathcal{A}$ is a $\mathbb{C}$-vector space with a left $\mathcal{A}$-module structure and an $\mathcal{A}$-valued inner product ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\langle \ | \ \rangle$ satisfying the following conditions [8, Definition 1.1]:

(1) ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\langle \ | \ \rangle$ is left linear and right conjugate linear.

(2) ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\langle ax \mid y\rangle = a\,{}_{\mathcal{A}}\langle x \mid y\rangle$ and ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\langle x \mid ay\rangle = {}_{\mathcal{A}}\langle x \mid y\rangle a^*$ for all $x, y \in {}_{\mathcal{A}}X$ and $a \in \mathcal{A}$.

(3) ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\langle x \mid x\rangle \geq 0$ for all $x \in {}_{\mathcal{A}}X$, and ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\langle x \mid x\rangle = 0$ if and only if $x = 0$.

(4) ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\langle x \mid y\rangle = {}_{\mathcal{A}}\langle y \mid x\rangle^*$ for all $x, y \in {}_{\mathcal{A}}X$.

(5) ${}_{\mathcal{A}}X$ is complete with respect to the norm $\|x\| = \|{}_{\mathcal{A}}\langle x \mid x\rangle\|^{\frac{1}{2}}$.

It is said to be (left) full if the closed linear span of $\{{}_{\mathcal{A}}\langle x \mid y\rangle \mid x, y \in {}_{\mathcal{A}}X\}$ is equal to $\mathcal{A}$.

Similarly a right Hilbert C^*-module $X_{\mathcal{B}}$ over $\mathcal{B}$ is defined as a $\mathbb{C}$-vector space with a right $\mathcal{B}$-module structure and a $\mathcal{B}$-valued inner product $\langle \ | \ \rangle_{\mathcal{B}}$ satisfying the following conditions [8, Definition 1.2]:

(1) $\langle \ \ | \ \ \rangle_{\mathcal{B}}$ is left conjugate and right linear.

(2) $\langle x \mid yb\rangle_{\mathcal{B}} = \langle x \mid y\rangle_{\mathcal{B}} b$ and $\langle xb \mid y\rangle_{\mathcal{B}} = b^*\langle x \mid y\rangle_{\mathcal{B}}$ for all $x, y \in X_{\mathcal{B}}$ and $b \in \mathcal{B}$.

(3) $\langle x \mid x\rangle_{\mathcal{B}} \geq 0$ for all $x \in X_{\mathcal{B}}$, and $\langle x \mid x\rangle_{\mathcal{B}} = 0$ if and only if $x = 0$.

(4) $\langle x \mid y\rangle_{\mathcal{B}} = \langle y \mid x\rangle_{\mathcal{B}}^*$ for all $x, y \in X_{\mathcal{B}}$.

(5) $X_{\mathcal{B}}$ is complete with respect to the norm $\|x\| = \|\langle x \mid x\rangle_{\mathcal{B}}\|^{\frac{1}{2}}$.

It is said to be (right) full if the closed linear span of $\{\langle x \mid y\rangle_{\mathcal{B}} \mid x, y \in X_{\mathcal{B}}\}$ is equal to $\mathcal{B}$.

Throughout the paper, we mean by an $\mathcal{A}$–$\mathcal{B}$-bimodule written ${}_{\mathcal{A}}X_{\mathcal{B}}$ a left Hilbert C^*-module over $\mathcal{A}$ and also a right Hilbert C^*-module over $\mathcal{B}$ in the above sense ([19], [8], [18], etc.). In [19, Definition 6.10], M. Rieffel has defined the notion of an $\mathcal{A}$–$\mathcal{B}$-imprimitivity bimodule in the following way. An $\mathcal{A}$–$\mathcal{B}$-bimodule ${}_{\mathcal{A}}X_{\mathcal{B}}$ is said to be $\mathcal{A}$–$\mathcal{B}$-imprimitivity bimodule if the three conditions below hold

(1) ${}_{\mathcal{A}}X_{\mathcal{B}}$ is a full left Hilbert $\mathcal{A}$-module with $\mathcal{A}$-valued left inner product ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\langle \ \ | \ \ \rangle$, and a full right Hilbert $\mathcal{B}$-module with $\mathcal{B}$-valued right inner product $\langle \ \ | \ \ \rangle_{\mathcal{B}}$,

(2) $\langle a \cdot x \mid y\rangle_{\mathcal{B}} = \langle x \mid a^* \cdot y\rangle_{\mathcal{B}}$ and ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\langle x \cdot b \mid y\rangle = {}_{\mathcal{A}}\langle x \mid y \cdot b^*\rangle$ for all $x, y \in {}_{\mathcal{A}}X_{\mathcal{B}}$ and $a \in \mathcal{A}$, $b \in \mathcal{B}$.

(3) ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\langle x \mid y\rangle \cdot z = x \cdot \langle y \mid z\rangle_{\mathcal{B}}$ for all $x, y, z \in {}_{\mathcal{A}}X_{\mathcal{B}}$.

We note that the above condition (2) implies

$$\|{}_{\mathcal{A}}\langle x \mid x\rangle\| = \|\langle x \mid x\rangle_{\mathcal{B}}\| \qquad x \in {}_{\mathcal{A}}X_{\mathcal{B}} \tag{2.1}$$

so that the two norms on ${}_{\mathcal{A}}X_{\mathcal{B}}$ induced by the left hand side and the right hand side of (2.1) coincide (cf. [8, Corollary 1.19], [18, Proposition 3.11]).

Y. Watatani in [23] has introduced the notion of a finite basis of a Hilbert C^*-module to construct C^*-index theory. We follow his definition of finite basis. An $\mathcal{A}$–$\mathcal{B}$-imprimitivity bimodule ${}_{\mathcal{A}}X_{\mathcal{B}}$ has a right finite basis if there exists a finite family $\{\eta_c\}_{c\in\mathcal{E}_C} \subset {}_{\mathcal{A}}X_{\mathcal{B}}$ of vectors indexed by a finite set $\mathcal{E}_C$ such that

$$x = \sum_{c\in\mathcal{E}_C} \eta_c\langle \eta_c \mid x\rangle_{\mathcal{B}} \quad \text{for } x \in {}_{\mathcal{A}}X_{\mathcal{B}}. \tag{2.2}$$

We note that the condition (2.2) is equivalent to the condition

$$\sum_{c\in\mathcal{E}_C} {}_{\mathcal{A}}\langle \eta_c \mid \eta_c\rangle = 1 \qquad \text{in } \mathcal{A} \tag{2.3}$$

if $\mathcal{A}$ is unital and the center $Z(\mathcal{A})$ of $\mathcal{A}$ is $\mathbb{C}$, because of the identity $\eta_c\langle \eta_c \mid x\rangle_{\mathcal{B}} = {}_{\mathcal{A}}\langle \eta_c \mid \eta_c\rangle x$ ([8, Proposition 1.13]). Similarly an $\mathcal{A}$–$\mathcal{B}$-imprimitivity bimodule ${}_{\mathcal{A}}X_{\mathcal{B}}$ has a left finite basis if there exists a finite family $\{\zeta_d\}_{d\in\mathcal{E}_D} \subset {}_{\mathcal{A}}X_{\mathcal{B}}$ of vectors indexed by a finite set $\mathcal{E}_D$ such that

$$x = \sum_{d\in\mathcal{E}_D} {}_{\mathcal{A}}\langle x \mid \zeta_d\rangle\zeta_d \quad \text{for } x \in {}_{\mathcal{A}}X_{\mathcal{B}}. \tag{2.4}$$

Definition 2.1. Let ${}_{\mathcal{A}}X_{\mathcal{B}}$ be an $\mathcal{A}$–$\mathcal{B}$-imprimitivity bimodule with a right finite basis $\{\eta_c\}_{c\in\mathcal{E}_C} \subset {}_{\mathcal{A}}X_{\mathcal{B}}$ and a left finite basis $\{\zeta_d\}_{d\in\mathcal{E}_D} \subset {}_{\mathcal{A}}X_{\mathcal{B}}$, respectively. The bases $\{\eta_c\}_{c\in\mathcal{E}_C}$ and $\{\zeta_d\}_{d\in\mathcal{E}_D}$ are said to be *finitely related* if there exist

$$\text{an } \mathcal{E}_C \times \mathcal{E}_D - \text{matrix } \tilde{C} = [\tilde{C}(c,d)]_{c\in\mathcal{E}_C, d\in\mathcal{E}_D} \text{ with entries in } \{0,1\}, \text{ and}$$
$$\text{an } \mathcal{E}_D \times \mathcal{E}_C - \text{matrix } \tilde{D} = [\tilde{D}(d,c)]_{d\in\mathcal{E}_D, c\in\mathcal{E}_C} \text{ with entries in } \{0,1\}$$

such that

$$\langle \eta_c \mid \eta_c \rangle_{\mathcal{B}} = \sum_{d\in\mathcal{E}_D} \tilde{C}(c,d) \langle \zeta_d \mid \zeta_d \rangle_{\mathcal{B}}, \qquad c \in \mathcal{E}_C, \tag{2.5}$$
$${}_{\mathcal{A}}\langle \zeta_d \mid \zeta_d \rangle = \sum_{c\in\mathcal{E}_C} \tilde{D}(d,c) {}_{\mathcal{A}}\langle \eta_c \mid \eta_c \rangle, \qquad d \in \mathcal{E}_D \tag{2.6}$$

and

$${}_{\mathcal{A}}\langle \zeta_d \mid \eta_c \rangle \cdot {}_{\mathcal{A}}\langle \eta_c \mid \zeta_d \rangle = \tilde{C}(c,d) {}_{\mathcal{A}}\langle \zeta_d \mid \zeta_d \rangle, \qquad c \in \mathcal{E}_C,\ d \in \mathcal{E}_D, \tag{2.7}$$
$$\langle \eta_c \mid \zeta_d \rangle_{\mathcal{B}} \cdot \langle \zeta_d \mid \eta_c \rangle_{\mathcal{B}} = \tilde{D}(d,c) \langle \eta_c \mid \eta_c \rangle_{\mathcal{B}}, \qquad c \in \mathcal{E}_C,\ d \in \mathcal{E}_D. \tag{2.8}$$

In this case the quintuplet $({}_{\mathcal{A}}X_{\mathcal{B}}, \{\eta_c\}_{c\in\mathcal{E}_C}, \{\zeta_d\}_{d\in\mathcal{E}_D}, \tilde{C}, \tilde{D})$ is called a *bipartitely related* $\mathcal{A}$–$\mathcal{B}$-imprimitivity bimodule.

Definition 2.2. Let ${}_{\mathcal{A}}X_{\mathcal{B}}$ be an $\mathcal{A}$–$\mathcal{B}$-imprimitivity bimodule with right finite basis $\{\eta_c\}_{c\in\mathcal{E}_C} \subset {}_{\mathcal{A}}X_{\mathcal{B}}$, and ${}_{\mathcal{B}}Y_{\mathcal{A}}$ be a $\mathcal{B}$–$\mathcal{A}$-imprimitivity bimodule with right finite basis $\{\xi_d\}_{d\in\mathcal{E}_D} \subset {}_{\mathcal{B}}Y_{\mathcal{A}}$, respectively. The bases $\{\eta_c\}_{c\in\mathcal{E}_C}$ and $\{\xi_d\}_{d\in\mathcal{E}_D}$ are said to be *finitely related* if there exist

$$\text{an } \mathcal{E}_C \times \mathcal{E}_D - \text{matrix } \tilde{C} = [\tilde{C}(c,d)]_{c\in\mathcal{E}_C, d\in\mathcal{E}_D} \text{ with entries in } \{0,1\}, \text{ and}$$
$$\text{an } \mathcal{E}_D \times \mathcal{E}_C - \text{matrix } \tilde{D} = [\tilde{D}(d,c)]_{d\in\mathcal{E}_D, c\in\mathcal{E}_C} \text{ with entries in } \{0,1\}$$

such that

$$\langle \eta_c \mid \eta_c \rangle_{\mathcal{B}} = \sum_{d\in\mathcal{E}_D} \tilde{C}(c,d) {}_{\mathcal{B}}\langle \xi_d \mid \xi_d \rangle, \qquad c \in \mathcal{E}_C, \tag{2.9}$$
$$\langle \xi_d \mid \xi_d \rangle_{\mathcal{A}} = \sum_{c\in\mathcal{E}_C} \tilde{D}(d,c) {}_{\mathcal{A}}\langle \eta_c \mid \eta_c \rangle, \qquad d \in \mathcal{E}_D \tag{2.10}$$

and

$$\langle \langle \eta_c \mid \eta_c \rangle_{\mathcal{B}} \xi_d \mid \xi_d \rangle_{\mathcal{A}} = \tilde{C}(c,d) \langle \xi_d \mid \xi_d \rangle_{\mathcal{A}}, \qquad c \in \mathcal{E}_C,\ d \in \mathcal{E}_D \tag{2.11}$$
$$\langle \langle \xi_d \mid \xi_d \rangle_{\mathcal{A}} \eta_c \mid \eta_c \rangle_{\mathcal{B}} = \tilde{D}(d,c) \langle \eta_c \mid \eta_c \rangle_{\mathcal{B}}, \qquad c \in \mathcal{E}_C,\ d \in \mathcal{E}_D. \tag{2.12}$$

We will know from (2.18) that the left hand sides of (2.11) and (2.12) will coincide with the inner products $\langle \eta_c \otimes_{\mathcal{B}} \xi_d \mid \eta_c \otimes_{\mathcal{B}} \xi_d \rangle_{\mathcal{A}}$ and $\langle \xi_d \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} \eta_c \mid \xi_d \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} \eta_c \rangle_{\mathcal{B}}$ of their respect relative tensor products.

If two imprimitivity bimodules ${}_{\mathcal{A}}X_{\mathcal{B}}$ and ${}_{\mathcal{B}}Y_{\mathcal{A}}$ have finitely related basis, they are called *finitely related imprimitivity bimodules*.

For an $\mathcal{A}$–$\mathcal{B}$ imprimitivity bimodule ${}_{\mathcal{A}}X_{\mathcal{B}}$, its conjugate module $\overline{{}_{\mathcal{A}}X_{\mathcal{B}}}$ as a $\mathcal{B}$–$\mathcal{A}$ imprimitivity bimodule is defined in the following way ([19, Definition 6.17], cf. [8], [18]). The module $\overline{{}_{\mathcal{A}}X_{\mathcal{B}}}$ is ${}_{\mathcal{A}}X_{\mathcal{B}}$ itself as a set. Let us denote by $\bar{x}$ in $\overline{{}_{\mathcal{A}}X_{\mathcal{B}}}$ the element x in ${}_{\mathcal{A}}X_{\mathcal{B}}$. Its module structure with inner products are defined by

(i) $\bar{x}+\bar{y} := \overline{x+y}$ and $\lambda\cdot\bar{x} := \overline{\bar{\lambda}x}$ for all $\lambda\in\mathbb{C}, x, y \in {}_{\mathcal{A}}X_{\mathcal{B}}$.

(ii) $b\cdot\bar{x}\cdot a := \overline{a^*xb^*}$ for all $a\in\mathcal{A}, b\in\mathcal{B}, x\in{}_{\mathcal{A}}X_{\mathcal{B}}$.

(iii) ${}_{\mathcal{B}}\langle\bar{x},\bar{y}\rangle := \langle x,y\rangle_{\mathcal{B}}$ and $\langle\bar{x},\bar{y}\rangle_{\mathcal{A}} := {}_{\mathcal{A}}\langle x,y\rangle$ for all $x, y\in{}_{\mathcal{A}}X_{\mathcal{B}}$.

The following lemma is straightforward.

Lemma 2.3. *Let ${}_{\mathcal{A}}X_{\mathcal{B}}$ be an $\mathcal{A}$–$\mathcal{B}$-imprimitivity bimodule with right finite basis $\{\eta_c\}_{c\in\mathcal{E}_C}\subset{}_{\mathcal{A}}X_{\mathcal{B}}$ and left finite basis $\{\zeta_d\}_{d\in\mathcal{E}_D}\subset{}_{\mathcal{A}}X_{\mathcal{B}}$. Then $\{\eta_c\}_{c\in\mathcal{E}_C}$ and $\{\zeta_d\}_{d\in\mathcal{E}_D}$ are finitely related in ${}_{\mathcal{A}}X_{\mathcal{B}}$ if and only if $\{\eta_c\}_{c\in\mathcal{E}_C}$ in ${}_{\mathcal{A}}X_{\mathcal{B}}$ and the conjugate basis $\{\bar{\zeta}_d\}_{d\in\mathcal{E}_D}$ in $\overline{{}_{\mathcal{A}}X_{\mathcal{B}}}$ are finitely related.*

For $\mathcal{A}=\mathcal{B}$, a right finite basis $\{s_a\}_{a\in\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{A}}}$ with an index set $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{A}}$ of an $\mathcal{A}$–$\mathcal{A}$-imprimitivity bimodule ${}_{\mathcal{A}}X_{\mathcal{A}}$ is said to be *finitely self-related* if there exist an $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{A}}\times\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{A}}$-matrix $\tilde{A}=[\tilde{A}(a,b)]_{a,b\in\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{A}}}$ with entries in $\{0,1\}$ such that

$$\langle s_a\mid s_a\rangle_{\mathcal{A}} = \sum_{b\in\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{A}}}\tilde{A}(a,b)\,{}_{\mathcal{A}}\langle s_b\mid s_b\rangle, \qquad a\in\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{A}}, \tag{2.13}$$

$$\langle\langle s_a\mid s_a\rangle_{\mathcal{A}}s_b\mid s_b\rangle_{\mathcal{A}} = \tilde{A}(a,b)\langle s_b\mid s_b\rangle_{\mathcal{A}}, \qquad a,b\in\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{A}}. \tag{2.14}$$

If an $\mathcal{A}$–$\mathcal{A}$-imprimitivity bimodule ${}_{\mathcal{A}}X_{\mathcal{A}}$ has a finitely self-related right finite basis, it is called a *finitely self-related imprimitivity bimodule.*

A C^*-algebra itself $\mathcal{A}$ has a natural structure of $\mathcal{A}$–$\mathcal{A}$ imprimitivity bimodule by the inner products

$$\langle x\mid y\rangle_{\mathcal{A}} := x^*y, \qquad {}_{\mathcal{A}}\langle x\mid y\rangle := xy^* \quad \text{for} \quad x,y\in\mathcal{A}. \tag{2.15}$$

We write the $\mathcal{A}$–$\mathcal{A}$ imprimitivity bimodule as ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{A}}$ and call it the identity $\mathcal{A}$–$\mathcal{A}$ imprimitivity bimodule. If the identity $\mathcal{A}$–$\mathcal{A}$ imprimitivity bimodule ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{A}}$ has a finitely self-related right finite basis $\{s_a\}_{a\in\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{A}}}$, the C^*-algebra $\mathcal{A}$ with the basis $\{s_a\}_{a\in\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{A}}}$ is said to be *finitely self-related*.

Lemma 2.4. *Let $A=[A(i,j)]_{i,j=1}^N$ be a nonnegative irreducible matrix. Let $\{S_a\}_{a\in E_A}$ be the generating partial isometries of the Cuntz–Krieger algebra $\mathcal{O}_A$ satisfying the relations* (1.2) *for the matrix A^G. Then $\{S_a\}_{a\in E_A}$ is a finitely self-related right finite basis of the identity $\mathcal{O}_A$–$\mathcal{O}_A$-imprimitivity bimodule ${}_{\mathcal{O}_A}\mathcal{O}_{A\mathcal{O}_A}$.*

Proof. Let $\langle\ \mid\ \rangle_A$ denote the $\mathcal{O}_A$-valued right inner product $\langle\ \mid\ \rangle_{\mathcal{O}_A}$ defined by the left one in (2.15). Since

$$x=\sum_{a\in E_A}S_aS_a^*x=\sum_{a\in E_A}S_a\langle S_a\mid x\rangle_A, \qquad x\in{}_{\mathcal{O}_A}\mathcal{O}_{A\mathcal{O}_A}=\mathcal{O}_A, \tag{2.16}$$

$\{S_a\}_{a\in E_A}$ is a right finite basis of ${}_{\mathcal{O}_A}\mathcal{O}_{A\mathcal{O}_A}$. The second relation of (1.2) is rephrased as (2.13) for the matrix $\tilde{A}=A^G$. We also have

$$\begin{aligned}\langle\langle S_a\mid S_a\rangle_A S_b\mid S_b\rangle_A &= ((S_a^*S_a)S_b)^*S_b\\ &= S_b^*\sum_{a'\in E_A}A^G(a,a')S_{a'}S_{a'}^*S_b\\ &= A^G(a,b)S_b^*S_b\\ &= A^G(a,b)\langle S_b\mid S_b\rangle_A, \qquad a,b\in E_A.\end{aligned}$$

Hence the basis $\{S_a\}_{a\in E_A}$ is finitely self-related. □

For an $\mathcal{A}$–$\mathcal{B}$-imprimitivity bimodule ${}_{\mathcal{A}}X_{\mathcal{B}}$ and a $\mathcal{B}$–$\mathcal{A}$-imprimitivity bimodule ${}_{\mathcal{B}}Y_{\mathcal{A}}$, there is a natural method to construct $\mathcal{A}$–$\mathcal{A}$-imprimitivity bimodule ${}_{\mathcal{A}}X_{\mathcal{B}} \otimes_{\mathcal{B}} {}_{\mathcal{B}}Y_{\mathcal{A}}$ and $\mathcal{B}$–$\mathcal{B}$-imprimitivity bimodule ${}_{\mathcal{B}}Y_{\mathcal{A}} \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} {}_{\mathcal{A}}X_{\mathcal{B}}$ as relative tensor products of Hilbert C^*-bimodules as seen in [19, Theorem 5.9] (cf. [8, Definition 1.20] and [18, Proposition 3.16]). The $\mathcal{A}$-bimodule structure of ${}_{\mathcal{A}}X_{\mathcal{B}} \otimes_{\mathcal{B}} {}_{\mathcal{B}}Y_{\mathcal{A}}$ is given by

$$a(x \otimes_{\mathcal{B}} y) := ax \otimes_{\mathcal{B}} y, \qquad (x \otimes_{\mathcal{B}} y)a := x \otimes_{\mathcal{B}} ya \quad \text{for } x \in {}_{\mathcal{A}}X_{\mathcal{B}},\ y \in {}_{\mathcal{B}}Y_{\mathcal{A}},\ a \in \mathcal{A}.$$

The $\mathcal{A}$-valued right inner product and the $\mathcal{A}$-valued left inner product of ${}_{\mathcal{A}}X_{\mathcal{B}} \otimes_{\mathcal{B}} {}_{\mathcal{B}}Y_{\mathcal{A}}$ are given by

$$ {}_{\mathcal{A}}\langle x_1 \otimes_{\mathcal{B}} y_1 \mid x_2 \otimes_{\mathcal{B}} y_2 \rangle := {}_{\mathcal{A}}\langle x_1 {}_{\mathcal{B}}\langle y_1 \mid y_2 \rangle \mid x_2 \rangle, \tag{2.17}$$

$$ \langle x_1 \otimes_{\mathcal{B}} y_1 \mid x_2 \otimes_{\mathcal{B}} y_2 \rangle_{\mathcal{A}} := \langle y_1 \mid \langle x_1 \mid x_2 \rangle_{\mathcal{B}} y_2 \rangle_{\mathcal{A}}. \tag{2.18}$$

Similarly we have $\mathcal{B}$–$\mathcal{B}$-imprimitivity bimodule ${}_{\mathcal{B}}Y_{\mathcal{A}} \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} {}_{\mathcal{A}}X_{\mathcal{B}}$.

Definition 2.5. Let $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ be C^*-algebras. Finitely self-related imprimitivity bimodules $({}_{\mathcal{A}}Z^1_{\mathcal{A}}, \{s_a\}_{a\in\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{A}}})$ and $({}_{\mathcal{B}}Z^2_{\mathcal{B}}, \{t_b\}_{b\in\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{B}}})$ with finitely self-related right finite bases $\{s_a\}_{a\in\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{A}}}$ and $\{t_b\}_{b\in\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{B}}}$ respectively are said to be *basis relatedly elementary Morita equivalent* if there exist finitely related $\mathcal{A}$–$\mathcal{B}$-imprimitivity bimodule ${}_{\mathcal{A}}X_{\mathcal{B}}$ and $\mathcal{B}$–$\mathcal{A}$-imprimitivity bimodule ${}_{\mathcal{B}}Y_{\mathcal{A}}$ with finitely related right finite bases $\{\eta_c\}_{c\in\mathcal{E}_C} \subset {}_{\mathcal{A}}X_{\mathcal{B}}$ and $\{\xi_d\}_{d\in\mathcal{E}_D} \subset {}_{\mathcal{B}}Y_{\mathcal{A}}$, respectively such that there exist maps $c : \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{A}} \cup \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{B}} \longrightarrow \mathcal{E}_C$, $d : \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{A}} \cup \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{B}} \longrightarrow \mathcal{E}_D$ such that the correspondences

$$\varphi_{\mathcal{A}} : s_a \in {}_{\mathcal{A}}Z^1_{\mathcal{A}} \longrightarrow \eta_{c(a)} \otimes_{\mathcal{B}} \xi_{d(a)} \in {}_{\mathcal{A}}X_{\mathcal{B}} \otimes_{\mathcal{B}} {}_{\mathcal{B}}Y_{\mathcal{A}}, \tag{2.19}$$

$$\varphi_{\mathcal{B}} : t_b \in {}_{\mathcal{B}}Z^2_{\mathcal{B}} \longrightarrow \xi_{d(b)} \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} \eta_{c(b)} \in {}_{\mathcal{B}}Y_{\mathcal{A}} \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} {}_{\mathcal{A}}X_{\mathcal{B}} \tag{2.20}$$

give rise to bimodule isomorphisms, where a bimodule isomorphism means an isomorphism of bimodule which preserves their left and right inner products, respectively. (cf. [18, p. 57]).

The isomorphisms $\varphi_{\mathcal{A}}, \varphi_{\mathcal{B}}$ are called *basis relatedly bimodule isomorphisms*. If pairs $({}_{\mathcal{A}}Z^1_{\mathcal{A}}, \{s_a\}_{a\in\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{A}}})$ and $({}_{\mathcal{B}}Z^2_{\mathcal{B}}, \{t_b\}_{b\in\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{B}}})$ are connected by a finite sequence of basis related elementary Morita equivalences, then they are said to be *basis relatedly Morita equivalent*.

Definition 2.6. (i) A pair $(\mathcal{A}, \{s_a\}_{a\in E_{\mathcal{A}}})$ of a C^*-algebra and a finitely self-related right finite basis of the identity imprimitivity bimodule ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{A}}$ is called *a C^*-algebra with right finite basis*.

(ii) Two C^*-algebras $(\mathcal{A}, \{s_a\}_{a\in E_{\mathcal{A}}})$ and $(\mathcal{B}, \{t_b\}_{b\in E_{\mathcal{B}}})$ with right finite bases are said to be *basis relatedly elementary Morita equivalent* if the identity imprimitivity bimodules $({}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{A}}, \{s_a\}_{a\in\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{A}}})$ and $({}_{\mathcal{B}}\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{B}}, \{t_b\}_{b\in\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{B}}})$ are basis relatedly elementary Morita equivalent. They are said to *basis relatedly Morita equivalent* if $({}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{A}}, \{s_a\}_{a\in\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{A}}})$ and $({}_{\mathcal{B}}\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{B}}, \{t_b\}_{b\in\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{B}}})$ are basis relatedly Morita equivalent.

By Lemma 2.4, the Cuntz–Krieger algebra $(\mathcal{O}_A, \{S_a\}_{a\in E_A})$ with the generating partial isometries $\{S_a\}_{a\in E_A}$ satisfying (1.2) is a C^*-algebra with right finite basis. The right finite basis $\{S_a\}_{a\in E_A}$ is called the *canonical* right finite basis of $\mathcal{O}_A$.

Theorem 2.7. *Assume that nonnegative square irreducible matrices A and B are elementary equivalent such that $A = CD, B = DC$ for some nonnegative rectangular matrices C, D. Then the Cuntz–Krieger algebras $(\mathcal{O}_A, \{S_a\}_{a\in E_A})$ and $(\mathcal{O}_B, \{S_b\}_{b\in E_B})$ with the canonical right finite bases are basis relatedly elementary Morita equivalent.*

Proof. Suppose that two nonnegative square matrices A and B are elementary equivalent such that $A = CD$ and $B = DC$. The sizes of the matrices A and B are denoted by N and M respectively, so that C is an $N \times M$ matrix and D is an $M \times N$ matrix, respectively. We set the square matrix $Z = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & C \\ D & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ as a block matrix, and we see

$$Z^2 = \begin{bmatrix} CD & 0 \\ 0 & DC \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} A & 0 \\ 0 & B \end{bmatrix}.$$

Similarly to the directed graph $G_A = (V_A, E_A)$ for the matrix A, let us denote by $G_B = (V_B, E_B), G_C = (V_C, E_C), G_D = (V_D, E_D)$ and $G_Z = (V_Z, E_Z)$ the associated directed graphs to the nonnegative matrices B, C, D and Z, respectively, so that $V_C = V_D = V_Z = V_A \cup V_B$ and $E_Z = E_C \cup E_D$. By the equalities $A = CD$ and $B = DC$, we may take and fix bijections $\varphi_{A,CD}$ from E_A to a subset of $E_C \times E_D$ and $\varphi_{B,DC}$ from E_B to a subset of $E_D \times E_C$. Let $S_c, S_d, c \in E_C, d \in E_D$ be the generating partial isometries of the Cuntz–Krieger algebra $\mathcal{O}_Z$ for the matrix Z, so that $\sum_{c\in E_C} S_c S_c^* + \sum_{d\in E_D} S_d S_d^* = 1$ and

$$S_c^* S_c = \sum_{d\in E_D} Z^G(c,d) S_d S_d^* = \sum_{d\in E_D} C^G(c,d) S_d S_d^*, \qquad c \in E_C, \tag{2.21}$$

$$S_d^* S_d = \sum_{c\in E_C} Z^G(d,c) S_c S_c^* = \sum_{c\in E_C} D^G(d,c) S_c S_c^* \qquad d \in E_D, \tag{2.22}$$

for $c \in E_C, d \in E_D$, where Z^G, C^G, D^G are the matrices with entries in $\{0,1\}$ defined by similar ways to (1.1) from the directed graphs G_Z, G_C, G_D, respectively. Since $S_c S_d \neq 0$ (resp. $S_d S_c \neq 0$) if and only if $\varphi_{A,CD}(a) = cd$ (resp. $\varphi_{B,DC}(b) = dc$) for some $a \in E_A$ (resp. $b \in E_B$), we may identify cd (resp. dc) with a (resp. b) through the map $\varphi_{A,CD}$ (resp. $\varphi_{B,DC}$). In this case, we may write $a = c(a)d(a) \in E_C \times E_D$ (resp. $b = d(b)c(b) \in E_D \times E_C$) if $\varphi_{A,CD}(a) = cd$ (resp. $\varphi_{B,DC}(b) = dc$) to have maps

$$c : E_A \cup E_B \longrightarrow E_C, \qquad d : E_A \cup E_B \longrightarrow E_D.$$

We may then write $S_{c(a)d(a)} = S_a$ (resp. $S_{d(b)c(b)} = S_b$) where $S_{c(a)d(a)}$ denotes $S_{c(a)} S_{d(a)}$ (resp. $S_{d(b)c(b)}$ denotes $S_{d(b)} S_{c(b)}$). Let us define two particular projections P_A and P_B in $\mathcal{O}_Z$ by $P_A = \sum_{c\in E_C} S_c S_c^*$ and $P_B = \sum_{d\in E_D} S_d S_d^*$ so that $P_A + P_B = 1$. It has been shown in [12] (cf. [14]) that

$$P_A \mathcal{O}_Z P_A = \mathcal{O}_A, \qquad P_B \mathcal{O}_Z P_B = \mathcal{O}_B. \tag{2.23}$$

We set

$${}_A X_B = P_A \mathcal{O}_Z P_B, \qquad {}_B Y_A = P_B \mathcal{O}_Z P_A. \tag{2.24}$$

We equip $\mathcal{O}_Z$ with the structure of the identity $\mathcal{O}_Z$–$\mathcal{O}_Z$-imprimitivity bimodule defined by (2.15). As the submodules of ${}_{\mathcal{O}_Z}\mathcal{O}_{Z\mathcal{O}_Z}$, ${}_A X_B$ and ${}_B Y_A$ become $P_A\mathcal{O}_Z P_A$–$P_B\mathcal{O}_Z P_B$-imprimitivity bimodule and $P_B\mathcal{O}_Z P_B$–$P_A\mathcal{O}_Z P_A$-imprimitivity bimodule, respectively. As

in [12, Lemma 3.1], both projections P_A and P_B are full projections so that ${}_AX_B$ and ${}_BY_A$ are $\mathcal{O}_A$–$\mathcal{O}_B$ and $\mathcal{O}_B$–$\mathcal{O}_A$ imprimitivity bimodules. We set

$$\eta_c = S_c \quad \text{for } c \in E_C, \qquad \xi_d = S_d \quad \text{for } d \in E_D. \tag{2.25}$$

The relations (2.21) and (2.22) imply the equalities (2.9) and (2.10), respectively for $\tilde{C} = C^G$ and $\tilde{D} = D^G$. We denote by $\langle \ | \ \rangle_A$ and $\langle \ | \ \rangle_B$ the $\mathcal{O}_A$-valued right inner product $\langle \ | \ \rangle_{\mathcal{O}_A}$ in ${}_BY_A$ and the $\mathcal{O}_B$-valued right inner product $\langle \ | \ \rangle_{\mathcal{O}_B}$ in ${}_AX_B$, respectively. We also have

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \langle \eta_c \mid \eta_c \rangle_B \xi_d \mid \xi_d \rangle_A &= ((S_c^* S_c) S_d)^* S_d \\
&= S_d^* S_c^* S_c S_d \\
&= S_d^* \Big(\sum_{d' \in E_D} C^G(c, d') S_{d'} S_{d'}^* \Big) S_d \\
&= C^G(c, d) S_d^* S_d \\
&= C^G(c, d) \langle \xi_d \mid \xi_d \rangle_A .
\end{aligned}$$

Hence we have the equality (2.11) for $\tilde{C} = C^G$, and similarly (2.12) for $\tilde{D} = D^G$. Therefore ${}_AX_B$ and ${}_BY_A$ are finitely related imprimitivity bimodules. We note that the $\mathcal{O}_B$–$\mathcal{O}_A$-imprimitivity bimodule ${}_BY_A = P_B\mathcal{O}_Z P_A$ is the conjugate bimodule of ${}_AX_B = P_A\mathcal{O}_Z P_B$, because the correspondence

$$\Phi : \bar{x} \in \overline{P_A\mathcal{O}_Z P_B} \longrightarrow x^* \in P_B\mathcal{O}_Z P_A$$

yields an isomorphism of imprimitivity bimodules. By [18, Proposition 3.28], the correspondence

$$\Psi : x \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_B} y^* \in {}_AX_B \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_B} {}_BY_A \longrightarrow {}_A\langle x, y \rangle \in \mathcal{O}_A \quad \text{for } x, y \in {}_AX_B = P_A\mathcal{O}_Z P_B \tag{2.26}$$

yields an isomorphism between the $\mathcal{O}_A$–$\mathcal{O}_A$-imprimitive bimodules ${}_AX_B \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_B} {}_BY_A$ and ${}_{\mathcal{O}_A}\mathcal{O}_{A\mathcal{O}_A} = \mathcal{O}_A$. As

$$\Psi(\eta_{c(a)} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_B} \xi_{d(a)}) = \Psi(S_{c(a)} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_B} S_{d(a)}) = {}_A\langle S_{c(a)}, S_{d(a)}^* \rangle = S_{c(a)} S_{d(a)} = S_a$$

for $a \in E_A$, the correspondence

$$S_a \in \mathcal{O}_A \longrightarrow \eta_{c(a)} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_B} \xi_{d(a)} \in {}_AX_B \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_B} {}_BY_A$$

gives rise to a basis related bimodule isomorphism between ${}_AX_B \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_B} {}_BY_A$ and ${}_{\mathcal{O}_A}\mathcal{O}_{A\mathcal{O}_A} = \mathcal{O}_A$. We similarly know that

$$S_b \in \mathcal{O}_B \longrightarrow \xi_{d(b)} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_A} \eta_{c(b)} \in {}_BY_A \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_A} {}_AX_B$$

gives rise to a basis related bimodule isomorphism between ${}_BY_A \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_A} {}_AX_B$ and ${}_{\mathcal{O}_B}\mathcal{O}_{B\mathcal{O}_B} = \mathcal{O}_B$. Therefore the Cuntz–Krieger algebras $(\mathcal{O}_A, \{S_a\}_{a \in E_A})$ and $(\mathcal{O}_B, \{S_b\}_{b \in E_B})$ with the canonical right finite bases are basis relatedly elementary Morita equivalent. □

As seen in the above proof, under the condition that $A = CD, B = DC$, one may take ${}_BY_A$ as the conjugate bimodule of ${}_AX_B$, so that one obtains the following corollary.

Corollary 2.8. *Assume that nonnegative square irreducible matrices A, B are elementary equivalent such that $A = CD, B = DC$. Then there exists a bipartitely related $\mathcal{O}_A$–$\mathcal{O}_B$-imprimitivity bimodule $({}_AX_B, \{S_c\}_{c\in E_C}, \{S_d^*\}_{d\in E_D}, C^G, D^G)$ such that $({}_AX_B, \{S_c\}_{c\in E_C})$ and its conjugate $(\overline{{}_AX_B}, \{S_d\}_{d\in E_D})$ give rise to a basis related elementary Morita equivalence between $(\mathcal{O}_A, \{S_a\}_{a\in E_A})$ and $(\mathcal{O}_B, \{S_b\}_{b\in E_B})$.*

3 Converse implication of Theorem 2.7

In this section, we will show the converse implication of Theorem 2.7. Throughout this section, we assume that the Cuntz–Krieger algebras $(\mathcal{O}_A, \{S_a\}_{a\in E_A})$ and $(\mathcal{O}_B, \{S_b\}_{b\in E_B})$ with their canonical right finite bases are basis relatedly elementary Morita equivalent by finitely related $\mathcal{O}_A$–$\mathcal{O}_B$-imprimitivity bimodule ${}_{\mathcal{O}_A}X_{\mathcal{O}_B}$ written ${}_AX_B$ with right finite basis $\{\eta_c\}_{c\in\mathcal{E}_C}$ and $\mathcal{O}_B$–$\mathcal{O}_A$-imprimitivity bimodule ${}_{\mathcal{O}_B}Y_{\mathcal{O}_A}$ written ${}_BY_A$ with right finite basis $\{\xi_d\}_{d\in\mathcal{E}_D}$, where $\mathcal{E}_C$ and $\mathcal{E}_D$ are finite index sets, respectively. Let us denote by $\langle\ \ |\ \ \rangle_A$ and ${}_A\langle\ \ |\ \ \rangle$ the $\mathcal{O}_A$-valued right inner product of ${}_BY_A$ and the $\mathcal{O}_A$-valued left inner product of ${}_AX_B$, respectively. Similar notations $\langle\ \ |\ \ \rangle_B$ and ${}_B\langle\ \ |\ \ \rangle$ will be used. By Definition 2.5, one may take maps $c : E_A\cup E_B \longrightarrow \mathcal{E}_C$, $d : E_A\cup E_B \longrightarrow \mathcal{E}_D$ such that the correspondences

$$\varphi_A : S_a \in {}_{\mathcal{O}_A}\mathcal{O}_{A\mathcal{O}_A} \longrightarrow \eta_{c(a)}\otimes_{\mathcal{O}_B}\xi_{d(a)} \in {}_AX_B\otimes_{\mathcal{O}_B}{}_BY_A, \tag{3.1}$$

$$\varphi_B : t_b \in {}_{\mathcal{O}_B}\mathcal{O}_{B\mathcal{O}_B} \longrightarrow \xi_{d(b)}\otimes_{\mathcal{O}_B}\eta_{c(b)} \in {}_BY_A\otimes_{\mathcal{O}_A}{}_AX_B \tag{3.2}$$

give rise to bimodule isomorphisms. We take $\mathcal{E}_C\times\mathcal{E}_D$ matrix $\tilde{C} = [\tilde{C}(c,d)]_{c\in\mathcal{E}_C,d\in\mathcal{E}_D}$ and $\mathcal{E}_D\times\mathcal{E}_C$ matrix $\tilde{D} = [\tilde{D}(d,c)]_{d\in\mathcal{E}_D,c\in\mathcal{E}_C}$ satisfying (2.9), (2.10), (2.11), (2.12). The relative tensor product ${}_AX_B\otimes_{\mathcal{O}_B}{}_BY_A$ is written ${}_AX_B\otimes_B{}_BY_A$, and similar notation ${}_BY_A\otimes_A{}_AX_B$ will be used. We first note the following lemma.

Lemma 3.1. *Keep the above assumptions and notations.*

(i) $\tilde{C}(c(a),d(a)) = 1$ *for all* $a\in E_A$, *and hence*

$$\langle S_a\mid S_a\rangle_A = \langle\eta_{c(a)}\otimes_B\xi_{d(a)}\mid\eta_{c(a)}\otimes_B\xi_{d(a)}\rangle_A = \langle\xi_{d(a)}\mid\xi_{d(a)}\rangle_A, \tag{3.3}$$

$${}_A\langle S_a\mid S_a\rangle = {}_A\langle\eta_{c(a)}\otimes_B\xi_{d(a)}\mid\eta_{c(a)}\otimes_B\xi_{d(a)}\rangle \quad \text{for } a\in E_A. \tag{3.4}$$

(ii) $\tilde{D}(d(b),c(b)) = 1$ *for all* $b\in E_B$, *and hence*

$$\langle S_b\mid S_b\rangle_B = \langle\xi_{d(b)}\otimes_A\eta_{c(b)}\mid\xi_{d(b)}\otimes_A\eta_{c(b)}\rangle_B = \langle\eta_{c(b)}\mid\eta_{c(b)}\rangle_B, \tag{3.5}$$

$${}_B\langle S_b\mid S_b\rangle = {}_B\langle\xi_{d(b)}\otimes_A\eta_{c(b)}\mid\xi_{d(b)}\otimes_A\eta_{c(b)}\rangle \quad \text{for } b\in E_B. \tag{3.6}$$

Proof. (i) Since the map $\varphi_A : S_a\in{}_{\mathcal{O}_A}\mathcal{O}_{A\mathcal{O}_A}\longrightarrow\eta_{c(a)}\otimes_B\xi_{d(a)}\in{}_AX_B\otimes_B{}_BY_A$ in (3.1) gives rise to a bimodule isomorphism, we have

$$\langle S_a\mid S_a\rangle_A = \langle\varphi_A(S_a)\mid\varphi_A(S_a)\rangle_A = \langle\eta_{c(a)}\otimes_B\xi_{d(a)}\mid\eta_{c(a)}\otimes_B\xi_{d(a)}\rangle_A.$$

By the definition of inner products of relative tensor products in (2.17), (2.18) and the equality (2.11), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\langle\eta_{c(a)}\otimes_B\xi_{d(a)}\mid\eta_{c(a)}\otimes_B\xi_{d(a)}\rangle_A &= \langle\xi_{d(a)}\mid\langle\eta_{c(a)}\mid\eta_{c(a)}\rangle_B\xi_{d(a)}\rangle_A\\ &= \langle\langle\eta_{c(a)}\mid\eta_{c(a)}\rangle_B\xi_{d(a)}\mid\xi_{d(a)}\rangle_A\\ &= \tilde{C}(c(a),d(a))\langle\xi_{d(a)}\mid\xi_{d(a)}\rangle_A\end{aligned}$$

so that

$$\langle S_a \mid S_a\rangle_A = \tilde{C}(c(a), d(a))\langle \xi_{d(a)} \mid \xi_{d(a)}\rangle_A.$$

Since $\langle S_a \mid S_a\rangle_A = S_a^* S_a \neq 0$, we have $\tilde{C}(c(a), d(a))\langle \xi_{d(a)} \mid \xi_{d(a)}\rangle_A \neq 0$. As $\tilde{C}(c(a), d(a)) = 0$ or 1, we conclude $\tilde{C}(c(a), d(a)) = 1$ and hence

$$\langle S_a \mid S_a\rangle_A = \langle \xi_{d(a)} \mid \xi_{d(a)}\rangle_A.$$

We thus have (3.3). As the map $\varphi_A : S_a \in {}_{\mathcal{O}_A}\mathcal{O}_{A\mathcal{O}_A} \longrightarrow \eta_{c(a)} \otimes_B \xi_{d(a)} \in {}_AX_B \otimes_B {}_BY_A$ in (3.1) gives rise to a bimodule isomorphism, the equality (3.4) holds.

(ii) is similarly shown to (i). □

Lemma 3.2.

(i) $\tilde{C}(c(a), d) = 0$ *implies* $\langle \xi_d \mid \xi_{d(a)}\rangle_A = 0$. *Hence we have*

$$\sum_{d\in\mathcal{E}_D} \tilde{C}(c(a), d)_B\langle \xi_d \mid \xi_d\rangle \xi_{d(a)} = \xi_{d(a)}. \tag{3.7}$$

(ii) $\tilde{D}(d(b), c) = 0$ *implies* $\langle \eta_c \mid \eta_{c(b)}\rangle_B = 0$. *Hence we have*

$$\sum_{c\in\mathcal{E}_C} \tilde{D}(d(b), c)_A\langle \eta_c \mid \eta_c\rangle \eta_{c(b)} = \eta_{c(b)}. \tag{3.8}$$

Proof. (i) By (2.9), we have the following equalities:

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle S_a \mid S_a\rangle_A =& \langle \xi_{d(a)} \mid \langle \eta_{c(a)} \mid \eta_{c(a)}\rangle_B \xi_{d(a)}\rangle_A \\
=& \sum_{d\in\mathcal{E}_D} \tilde{C}(c(a), d)\langle \xi_{d(a)} \mid {}_B\langle \xi_d \mid \xi_d\rangle \xi_{d(a)}\rangle_A \\
=& \sum_{d\in\mathcal{E}_D} \tilde{C}(c(a), d)\langle \xi_{d(a)} \mid \xi_d\langle \xi_d \mid \xi_{d(a)}\rangle_A\rangle_A \\
=& \sum_{d\in\mathcal{E}_D} \tilde{C}(c(a), d)(\langle \xi_d \mid \xi_{d(a)}\rangle_A)^*\langle \xi_d \mid \xi_{d(a)}\rangle_A,
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \xi_{d(a)} \mid \xi_{d(a)}\rangle_A =& \langle \xi_{d(a)} \mid \sum_{d\in\mathcal{E}_D} \xi_d\langle \xi_d \mid \xi_{d(a)}\rangle_A\rangle_A \\
=& \sum_{d\in\mathcal{E}_D} (\langle \xi_d \mid \xi_{d(a)}\rangle_A)^*\langle \xi_d \mid \xi_{d(a)}\rangle_A.
\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 3.1, we have $\langle S_a \mid S_a\rangle_A = \langle \xi_{d(a)} \mid \xi_{d(a)}\rangle_A$ so that

$$\sum_{d\in\mathcal{E}_D} \tilde{C}(c(a), d)(\langle \xi_d \mid \xi_{d(a)}\rangle_A)^*\langle \xi_d \mid \xi_{d(a)}\rangle_A = \sum_{d\in\mathcal{E}_D} (\langle \xi_d \mid \xi_{d(a)}\rangle_A)^*\langle \xi_d \mid \xi_{d(a)}\rangle_A. \tag{3.9}$$

Since $\tilde{C}(c(a), d) = 0$ or 1, we get

$$\tilde{C}(c(a), d)\langle \xi_d \mid \xi_{d(a)}\rangle_A = \langle \xi_d \mid \xi_{d(a)}\rangle_A \qquad \text{for all } d \in \mathcal{E}_D. \tag{3.10}$$

This implies that $\langle \xi_d \mid \xi_{d(a)} \rangle_A = 0$ if $\tilde{C}(c(a), d) = 0$.

By (3.10), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{d \in \mathcal{E}_D} \tilde{C}(c(a), d) {}_B\langle \xi_d \mid \xi_d \rangle \xi_{d(a)} &= \sum_{d \in \mathcal{E}_D} \tilde{C}(c(a), d) \xi_d \langle \xi_d \mid \xi_{d(a)} \rangle_A \\ &= \sum_{d \in \mathcal{E}_D} \xi_d \langle \xi_d \mid \xi_{d(a)} \rangle_A = \xi_{d(a)}.\end{aligned}$$

(ii) is similarly shown to (i). □

The above lemma immediately implies the following lemma.

Lemma 3.3.

(i) *If $(c, d) \neq (c(a), d(a))$ for any $a \in E_A$, we have $\eta_c \otimes_B \xi_d = 0$.*

(ii) *If $(d, c) \neq (d(b), c(b))$ for any $b \in E_B$, we have $\xi_d \otimes_A \eta_c = 0$.*

Proof. (i) By Lemma 3.1,

$$ {}_A\langle S_a \mid S_a \rangle = {}_A\langle \eta_{c(a)} \otimes_B \xi_{d(a)} \mid \eta_{c(a)} \otimes_B \xi_{d(a)} \rangle, \qquad a \in E_A$$

so that

$$1 = \sum_{a \in E_A} S_a S_a^* = \sum_{a \in E_A} {}_A\langle \eta_{c(a)} \otimes_B \xi_{d(a)} \mid \eta_{c(a)} \otimes_B \xi_{d(a)} \rangle.$$

On the other hand, by the equality $\sum_{d \in \mathcal{E}_D} {}_{\mathcal{B}}\langle \xi_d \mid \xi_d \rangle = 1$ in $\mathcal{O}_B$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{c \in \mathcal{E}_C} \sum_{d \in \mathcal{E}_D} {}_A\langle \eta_c \otimes_B \xi_d \mid \eta_c \otimes_B \xi_d \rangle &= \sum_{c \in \mathcal{E}_C} \sum_{d \in \mathcal{E}_D} {}_A\langle \eta_c {}_B\langle \xi_d \mid \xi_d \rangle \mid \eta_c \rangle \\ &= \sum_{c \in \mathcal{E}_C} {}_A\langle \eta_c \sum_{d \in \mathcal{E}_D} {}_B\langle \xi_d \mid \xi_d \rangle \mid \eta_c \rangle \\ &= \sum_{c \in \mathcal{E}_C} {}_A\langle \eta_c \mid \eta_c \rangle = 1\end{aligned}$$

so that

$$1 = \sum_{a \in E_A} {}_A\langle \eta_{c(a)} \otimes_B \xi_{d(a)} \mid \eta_{c(a)} \otimes_B \xi_{d(a)} \rangle = \sum_{c \in \mathcal{E}_C} \sum_{d \in \mathcal{E}_D} {}_A\langle \eta_c \otimes_B \xi_d \mid \eta_c \otimes_B \xi_d \rangle.$$

As ${}_A\langle \eta_c \otimes_B \xi_d \mid \eta_c \otimes_B \xi_d \rangle \geq 0$, we have ${}_A\langle \eta_c \otimes_B \xi_d \mid \eta_c \otimes_B \xi_d \rangle = 0$ for $c \in \mathcal{E}_C, d \in \mathcal{E}_D$ with $(c, d) \neq (c(a), d(a))$ for any $a \in E_A$. This means that $\eta_c \otimes_B \xi_d = 0$ if $(c, d) \neq (c(a), d(a))$ for any $a \in E_A$.

(ii) is similarly shown to (i). □

Lemma 3.4.

(i) *$A^G(a_i, a_j) = \tilde{D}(d(a_i), c(a_j))$ for all $a_i, a_j \in E_A$.*

(ii) *$B^G(b_k, b_l) = \tilde{C}(c(b_k), d(b_l))$ for all $b_k, b_l \in E_B$.*

Proof. (i) The second operator relations of (1.2) is rewritten in ${}_{\mathcal{O}_A}\mathcal{O}_{A\mathcal{O}_A}$ such as:

$$\langle S_{a_i} \mid S_{a_i}\rangle_A = \sum_{j=1}^{N_A} A^G(a_i,a_j)\,{}_A\langle S_{a_j} \mid S_{a_j}\rangle, \qquad i=1,\dots,N_A. \tag{3.11}$$

By (2.10), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\langle S_{a_i} \mid S_{a_i}\rangle_A =& \langle \xi_{d(a_i)} \mid \xi_{d(a_i)}\rangle_A \\ =& \sum_{c\in\mathcal{E}_C} \tilde{D}(d(a_i),c)\,{}_A\langle \eta_c \mid \eta_c\rangle \\ =& \sum_{c\in\mathcal{E}_C} \tilde{D}(d(a_i),c) \sum_{d\in\mathcal{E}_D} {}_A\langle \eta_{cB}\langle \xi_d \mid \xi_d\rangle \mid \eta_c\rangle \\ =& \sum_{c\in\mathcal{E}_C}\sum_{d\in\mathcal{E}_D} \tilde{D}(d(a_i),c)\,{}_A\langle \eta_c\otimes_B \xi_d \mid \eta_c\otimes_B \xi_d\rangle.\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 3.3, we know ${}_A\langle \eta_c\otimes_B\xi_d \mid \eta_c\otimes_B\xi_d\rangle = 0$ if $(c,d)\neq(c(a_j),d(a_j))$ for any $a_j\in E_A$, so that we have by Lemma 3.1

$$\langle S_{a_i} \mid S_{a_i}\rangle_A = \sum_{a_j\in E_A} \tilde{D}(d(a_i),c(a_j))\,{}_A\langle \eta_{c(a_j)}\otimes_B \xi_{d(a_j)} \mid \eta_{c(a_j)}\otimes_B \xi_{d(a_j)}\rangle \tag{3.12}$$

$$= \sum_{a_j\in E_A} \tilde{D}(d(a_i),c(a_j))\,{}_A\langle S_{a_j} \mid S_{a_j}\rangle. \tag{3.13}$$

By (3.11), (3.13), we have

$$\sum_{a_j\in E_A} \tilde{D}(d(a_i),c(a_j)) S_{a_j}S_{a_j}^* = \sum_{a_j\in E_A} A^G(a_i,a_j) S_{a_j}S_{a_j}^* \tag{3.14}$$

so that $\tilde{D}(d(a_i),c(a_j)) = A^G(a_i,a_j)$ for all $a_i,a_j\in E_A$. □

Lemma 3.5.

(i) *For $a_i,a_j\in E_A$, we have $\tilde{D}(d(a_i),c(a_j))=1$ if and only if there exists $b_k\in E_B$ such that $d(a_i)=d(b_k)$ and $c(a_j)=c(b_k)$. In this case such b_k is unique.*

(ii) *For $b_k,b_l\in E_B$, we have $\tilde{C}(c(b_k),d(b_l))=1$ if and only if there exists $a_j\in E_A$ such that $c(b_k)=c(a_j)$ and $d(b_l)=d(a_j)$. In this case such a_j is unique.*

Proof. (i) Suppose that there exists $b_k\in E_B$ such that $d(a_i)=d(b_k)$ and $c(a_j)=c(b_k)$. By Lemma 3.1 (ii), we have $\tilde{D}(d(a_i),c(a_j))=1$.

Conversely, assume that $\tilde{D}(d(a_i),c(a_j))=1$. By (2.12) and (2.18), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \xi_{d(a_i)}\otimes_A \eta_{c(a_j)} \mid \xi_{d(a_i)}\otimes_A \eta_{c(a_j)}\rangle_B =& \tilde{D}(d(a_i),c(a_j))\langle \eta_{c(a_j)} \mid \eta_{c(a_j)}\rangle_B \\ =& \langle \eta_{c(a_j)} \mid \eta_{c(a_j)}\rangle_B \neq 0.\end{aligned}$$

Hence we have $\xi_{d(a_i)}\otimes_A \eta_{c(a_j)}\neq 0$. By Lemma 3.3 (ii) there exists $b_k\in E_B$ such that $d(a_i)=d(b_k)$ and $c(a_j)=c(b_k)$. Since $\varphi_B : S_b\in {}_{\mathcal{O}_B}\mathcal{O}_{B\mathcal{O}_B} \longrightarrow \xi_{d(b)}\otimes_A \eta_{c(b)}\in {}_BY_A\otimes_A {}_AX_B$ yields a bijective isomorphism, such b_k is unique.

(ii) is similar to (i). □

It is well-known that the relative tensor products of Hilbert C^*-bimodules are associative in the sense that $({}_AX_B\otimes_B {}_BY_A)\otimes_A {}_AX_B$ is naturally isomorphic to ${}_AX_B\otimes_B({}_BY_A\otimes_A {}_AX_B)$ so that one may identify the vectors $(\eta_c\otimes_B\xi_d)\otimes_A\eta_{c'}$ with $\eta_c\otimes_B(\xi_d\otimes_A\eta_{c'})$, that will be written $\eta_c\otimes_B\xi_d\otimes_A\eta_{c'}$. Similar notation $\xi_d\otimes_A\eta_c\otimes_B\xi_{d'}$ will be used.

Lemma 3.6. *Let $\eta_c,\eta_{c'}\in {}_AX_B$ for $c,c'\in\mathcal{E}_C$, and $\xi_d,\xi_{d'}\in {}_BY_A$ for $d,d'\in\mathcal{E}_D$.*

(i) *$\eta_c\otimes_B\xi_d\otimes_A\eta_{c'}\neq 0$ if and only if $\tilde{C}(c,d)=\tilde{D}(d,c')=1$.*

(ii) *$\xi_d\otimes_A\eta_c\otimes_B\xi_{d'}\neq 0$ if and only if $\tilde{D}(d,c)=\tilde{C}(c,d')=1$.*

Proof. (i) We have the following equalities:

$$\begin{aligned}\langle(\eta_c\otimes_B\xi_d)\otimes_A\eta_{c'}\mid(\eta_c\otimes_B\xi_d)\otimes_A\eta_{c'}\rangle_B=&\langle\eta_{c'}\mid\langle\langle\eta_c\mid\eta_c\rangle_B\xi_d\mid\xi_d\rangle_A\eta_{c'}\rangle_B\\=&\tilde{C}(c,d)\langle\eta_{c'}\mid\langle\xi_d\mid\xi_d\rangle_A\eta_{c'}\rangle_B\\=&\tilde{C}(c,d)\tilde{D}(d,c')\langle\eta_{c'}\mid\eta_{c'}\rangle_B.\end{aligned}$$

Hence we have $\eta_c\otimes_B\xi_d\otimes_A\eta_{c'}\neq 0$ if and only if $\tilde{C}(c,d)=\tilde{D}(d,c')=1$.

(ii) By a similar way to the above computation, we have

$$\langle(\xi_d\otimes_A\eta_c)\otimes_B\xi_{d'}\mid(\xi_d\otimes_A\eta_c)\otimes_B\xi_{d'}\rangle_A=\tilde{D}(d,c)\tilde{C}(c,d')\langle\xi_{d'}\mid\xi_{d'}\rangle_A.$$

Hence we have $\xi_d\otimes_A\eta_c\otimes_B\xi_{d'}\neq 0$ if and only if $\tilde{D}(d,c)=\tilde{C}(c,d')=1$. □

By using the above lemma, we provide the following two lemmas.

Lemma 3.7.

(i) *For $c\in\mathcal{E}_C$, suppose that*

$$\eta_c\otimes_B(\xi_{d(b_k)}\otimes_A\eta_{c(b_k)})\neq 0 \text{ for some } b_k\in E_B, \tag{3.15}$$

$$\eta_c\otimes_B(\xi_{d(b_l)}\otimes_A\eta_{c(b_l)})\neq 0 \text{ for some } b_l\in E_B. \tag{3.16}$$

Then we have $s(b_k)=s(b_l)$ in V_B.

(ii) *For $d\in\mathcal{E}_D$, suppose that*

$$\xi_d\otimes_A(\eta_{c(a_i)}\otimes_B\xi_{d(a_i)})\neq 0 \text{ for some } a_i\in E_A, \tag{3.17}$$

$$\xi_d\otimes_A(\eta_{c(a_j)}\otimes_B\xi_{d(a_j)})\neq 0 \text{ for some } a_j\in E_A. \tag{3.18}$$

Then we have $s(a_i)=s(a_j)$ in V_A.

Proof. (i) Assume that the equalities (3.15) and (3.16) hold. By Lemma 3.6, we have $\tilde{C}(c,d(b_k))=\tilde{C}(c,d(b_l))=1$. Since $\varphi_B: S_b\in\mathcal{O}_B\longrightarrow\xi_{d(b)}\otimes\eta_{c(b)}\in {}_BY_A\otimes_A {}_AX_B$ yields a bimodule isomorphism, we know that $c: E_B\longrightarrow\mathcal{E}_C$ is surjective, so that there exists $b_h\in E_B$ such that $c(b_h)=c$. By Lemma 3.4, we have

$$B^G(b_h,b_k)=\tilde{C}(c(b_h),d(b_k))=\tilde{C}(c,d(b_k))=1$$

so that $t(b_h)=s(b_k)$, and similarly $t(b_h)=s(b_l)$. Hence we obtain $s(b_k)=s(b_l)$.

(ii) is similarly shown to (i). □

Lemma 3.8.

(i) *For $c \in \mathcal{E}_C$, suppose that*

$$(\eta_{c(a_i)} \otimes_B \xi_{d(a_i)}) \otimes_A \eta_c \neq 0 \text{ for some } a_i \in E_A, \tag{3.19}$$

$$(\eta_{c(a_j)} \otimes_B \xi_{d(a_j)}) \otimes_A \eta_c \neq 0 \text{ for some } a_j \in E_A. \tag{3.20}$$

Then we have $t(a_i) = t(a_j)$ in V_A.

(ii) *For $d \in \mathcal{E}_D$, suppose that*

$$(\xi_{d(b_k)} \otimes_A \eta_{c(b_k)}) \otimes_B \xi_d \neq 0 \text{ for some } b_k \in E_B, \tag{3.21}$$

$$(\xi_{d(b_l)} \otimes_A \eta_{c(b_l)}) \otimes_B \xi_d \neq 0 \text{ for some } b_l \in E_B. \tag{3.22}$$

Then we have $t(b_k) = t(b_l)$ in V_B.

Proof. (i) Assume that the equalities (3.19) and (3.20) hold. By Lemma 3.6, we have $\tilde{D}(d(a_i), c) = \tilde{D}(d(a_j), c) = 1$. Since $\varphi_A : S_a \in \mathcal{O}_A \longrightarrow \eta_{c(a)} \otimes_B \xi_{d(a)} \in {}_AX_B \otimes_B {}_BY_A$ yields a bimodule isomorphism, we know that $c : E_A \longrightarrow \mathcal{E}_D$ is surjective, so that there exists $a_k \in E_A$ such that $c(a_k) = c$. By Lemma 3.4, we have

$$A^G(a_i, a_k) = \tilde{D}(d(a_i), c(a_k)) = \tilde{C}(d(a_i), c) = 1$$

so that $t(a_i) = s(a_k)$, and similarly $t(a_j) = s(a_k)$. Hence we obtain $t(a_i) = t(a_j)$.

(ii) is similarly shown to (i). □

Recall that A is an $N \times N$ matrix and B is an $M \times M$ matrix respectively, and $G_A = (V_A, E_A)$ and $G_B = (V_B, E_B)$ are the associated directed graphs such that $|V_A| = N$ and $|V_B| = M$, respectively. We will next construct an $N \times M$ nonnegative matrix C and an $M \times N$ nonnegative matrix D in the following way. Take arbitrary fixed $u \in V_A$ and $v \in V_B$, define the (u, v)-component $C(u, v)$ of the matrix C by setting

$$\begin{aligned} C(u,v) = |\{c(a_i) \in \mathcal{E}_C \mid &\text{there exist } a_i, a_j \in E_A \text{ and } b_k \in E_B \text{ such that} \\ &u = s(a_i),\ A^G(a_i, a_j) = 1, d(a_i) = d(b_k), c(a_j) = c(b_k),\ v = s(b_k)\}| \end{aligned}$$

as in Figure 1.



Figure 1:



Figure 2:

We similarly define the (v,u)-component $D(v,u)$ of the matrix D by setting

$$D(v,u) = |\{d(b_k) \in \mathcal{E}_D \mid \text{there exist } b_k, b_l \in E_B \text{ and } a_j \in E_A \text{ such that } v = s(b_k),\ B^G(b_k,b_l) = 1, c(b_k) = c(a_j), d(b_l) = d(a_j),\ u = s(a_j)\}|$$

as in Figure 2. We thus have $N \times M$ matrix $C = [C(u,v)]_{u \in V_A, v \in V_B}$, and $M \times N$ matrix $D = [D(v,u)]_{v \in V_B, u \in V_A}$.

Before reaching the theorem, we provide another lemma.

Lemma 3.9.

(i) *For $c(a) \in \mathcal{E}_C$ with $a \in E_A$, the vertices $u \in V_A$ and $v \in V_B$ satisfying $c(a) \in C(u,v)$ are unique. This means that if $c(a) \in C(u',v')$, then $u = u'$ and $v = v'$.*

(ii) *For $d(b) \in \mathcal{E}_D$ with $b \in E_B$, the vertices $v \in V_B$ and $u \in V_A$ satisfying $d(b) \in D(v,u)$ are unique. This means that if $d(b) \in D(v',u')$, then $v = v'$ and $u = u'$.*

Proof. (i) For $c(a) \in C(u,v)$, take $b_k \in E_B$ such that $v = s(b_k)$ and $d(a) = d(b_k)$. As

$$\eta_{c(a)} \otimes_B (\xi_{d(b_k)} \otimes_A \eta_{c(b_k)}) \neq 0, \tag{3.23}$$

by Lemma 3.7, the vertex $s(b_k)$ does not depend on the choice of b_k satisfying (3.23), so that the vertex v is uniquely determined by $c(a)$.

We also know that $u = s(a)$. Take $a_i \in E_A$ such that

$$(\eta_{c(a_i)} \otimes_B \xi_{d(a_i)}) \otimes_A \eta_{c(a)} \neq 0. \tag{3.24}$$

By Lemma 3.8, the vertex $t(a_i)$, which is $s(a) = u$ does not depend on the choice of a_i satisfying (3.24), so that the vertex u is uniquely determined by $c(a)$.

(ii) is smilarly shown to (i). □

Theorem 3.10. *$A = CD$ and $B = DC$.*

Proof. We will prove $A = CD$. Take arbitrary vertices $u_1, u_2 \in V_A$. We note that

$$A(u_1,u_2) = |\{a_i \in E_A \mid u_1 = s(a_i),\ u_2 = t(a_i)\}|.$$

We will define a correspondence

$$a_i \in A(u_1,u_2) \longrightarrow c(a_i) \times d(a_i) \in C(u_1,v) \times D(v,u_2) \text{ for some } v \in V_B. \tag{3.25}$$

Take an arbitrary edge $a_i \in E_A$ with $u_1 = s(a_i), u_2 = t(a_i)$. One may find an edge $a_j \in E_A$ such that $t(a_i) = s(a_j)$, and hence $A^G(a_i, a_j) = 1$. By Lemma 3.4, we have $\tilde{D}(d(a_i), c(a_j)) = 1$. By Lemma 3.5, there exists a unique edge $b_k \in E_B$ such that $d(a_i) = d(b_k), c(a_j) = c(b_k)$. We put $v = s(b_k) \in V_B$ so that $c(a_i) \in C(u_1, v)$. The vertex v is uniquely determined by $c(a_i)$ from Lemma 3.9.

One may further find an edge $a_k \in E_A$ such that $t(a_j) = s(a_k)$, and hence $A^G(a_j, a_k) = 1$. By Lemma 3.4, we have $\tilde{D}(d(a_j), c(a_k)) = 1$. By Lemma 3.5, there exists an edge $b_l \in E_B$ such that $d(a_j) = d(b_l), c(a_k) = c(b_l)$, so that $d(a_i) \in D(v, u_2)$. The vertex v is uniquely determined by $d(a_i)$ from Lemma 3.9. The situation is figured in Figure 3.



Figure 3:

Conversely, take an arbitrary fixed vertex $v \in V_B$. Let $c(a) \in C(u_1, v), d(a') \in D(v, u_2)$. By the condition $d(a') \in D(v, u_2)$, one may find $b_k, b_l \in E_B, a_j \in E_A$ such that $B^G(b_k, b_l) = 1$ and

$$d(a') = d(b_k),\ v = s(b_k),\ u_2 = s(a_j),\ c(b_k) = c(a_j),\ d(b_l) = d(a_j)$$

as in Figure 4. By the condition $c(a) \in C(u_1, v)$, one may find $a'_i, a'_j \in E_A, b'_k \in E_B$ such



Figure 4:

that $A^G(a'_i, a'_j) = 1$ and

$$c(a) = c(a'_i),\ u_1 = s(a'_i),\ v = s(b'_k),\ d(a'_i) = d(b'_k),\ c(a'_j) = c(b'_k)$$

as in Figure 5. There exists $a'_h \in E_A$ such that $A^G(a'_h, a'_i) = 1$. By Lemma 3.4, we have $\tilde{D}(d(a'_h), c(a'_i)) = 1$. By Lemma 3.5, there exists an edge $b'_h \in E_B$ such that $d(b'_h) = d(a'_h), c(b'_h) = c(a'_i)$ as in Figure 6.

As $t(b'_h) = s(b_k)$, we have $B^G(b'_h, b_k) = 1$. By Lemma 3.4, we have $\tilde{C}(c(b'_h), d(b_k)) = 1$. By Lemma 3.5, there exists an edge $a_i \in E_A$ such that $c(b'_h) = c(a_i), d(b_k) = d(a_i)$ so that



Figure 5:



Figure 6:

$c(a) = c(a_i), d(a') = d(a_i)$. Therefore we have a bijective correspondence

$$a_i \in A(u_1, u_2) \longleftrightarrow c(a_i) \times d(a_i) \in \cup_{v \in E_B} C(u_1, v) \times D(v, u_2). \tag{3.26}$$

This implies that $A(u_1, u_2) = \sum_{v \in E_B} C(u_1, v) D(v, u_2)$ and hence $A = CD$. We may similarly prove that $B = DC$. □

Remark 3.11. Let C, D be the matrices in the above proof. Put the block matrix $Z = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & C \\ D & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ with size $N+M$. Then the associated matrix Z^G satisfies $Z^G(c, d) = \tilde{C}(c, d)$ and $Z^G(d, c) = \tilde{D}(d, c)$ for $c \in \mathcal{E}_C, d \in \mathcal{E}_C$, so that $\tilde{C} = C^G, \tilde{D} = D^G$. We also have identifications between $\mathcal{E}_C$ and E_C and similarly betqeen $\mathcal{E}_D$ and E_D.

Therefore we reach the main result of the paper.

Theorem 3.12. *Let A, B be nonnegative square irreducible matrices that are not any permutations. Then A and B are elementary equivalent, that is, $A = CD, B = DC$ for some nonnegative rectangular matrices C, D, if and only if the Cuntz–Krieger algebras $(\mathcal{O}_A, \{S_a\}_{a \in E_A})$ and $(\mathcal{O}_B, \{S_b\}_{b \in E_B})$ with the canonical right finite bases are basis relatedly elementary Morita equivalent.*

As a corollary we have

Corollary 3.13. *Let A, B be nonnegative square irreducible matrices that are not any permutations. The two-sided topological Markov shifts $(\bar{X}_A, \bar{\sigma}_A)$ and $(\bar{X}_B, \bar{\sigma}_B)$ are topologically conjugate if and only if the Cuntz–Krieger algebras $(\mathcal{O}_A, \{S_a\}_{a \in E_A})$ and $(\mathcal{O}_B, \{S_b\}_{b \in E_B})$ with the canonical right finite bases are basis relatedly Morita equivalent.*

Acknowledgments: This work was also supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number 15K04896.

References

[1] L. G. Brown, *Stable isomorphism of hereditary subalgebras of C^*-algebras*, Pacific J. Math. **71**(1977), pp. 335–348.

[2] L. G. Brown, P. Green and M. A. Rieffel, *Stable isomorphism and strong Morita equivalence of C^*-algebras*, Pacific J. Math. **71**(1977), pp. 349–363.

[3] F. Combes, *Crossed products and Morita equivalence*, Proc. London Math. Soc. **49**(1984), pp. 289–306.

[4] D. Crocker, A. Kumjian, I. Raeburn and D. P. Williams, *An equivariant Brauer group and actions of groups of C^*-algebras*, J. Funct. Anal. **146**(1997), pp. 151–184.

[5] J. Cuntz, *A class of C^*-algebras and topological Markov chains II: reducible chains and the Ext-functor for C^*-algebras*, Invent. Math. **63**(1980), pp. 25–40.

[6] J. Cuntz and W. Krieger, *A class of C^*-algebras and topological Markov chains*, Invent. Math. **56**(1980), pp. 251–268.

[7] T. Kajiwara, C. Pinzari and Y. Watatani, *Ideal structure and simplicity of the C^*-algebras generated by Hilbert bimodules*, J. Funct. Anal. **195**(1998), pp. 295–322.

[8] T. Kajiwara and Y. Watatani, *Jones index theory by Hilbert C^*-modules and K-theory*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **352**(2000), pp. 3429–3472.

[9] G. G. Kasparov, *Hilbert C^*-modules: Theorem of Steinspring and Voiculescu*, J. Operator Theory **4**(1980), pp. 133–150.

[10] B. P. Kitchens, *Symbolic dynamics*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg and New York (1998).

[11] D. Lind and B. Marcus, *An introduction to symbolic dynamics and coding*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (1995).

[12] K. Matsumoto, *Strong shift equivalence of symbolic dynamical systems and Morita equivalence of C^*-algebras*, Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems **24**(2004), pp. 199–215.

[13] K. Matsumoto, *On strong shift equivalence of Hilbert C^*-bimodules*, Yokohama Math. J. **53**(2007), pp. 161–175.

[14] K. Matsumoto, *Continuous orbit equivalence, flow equivalence of Markov shifts and circle actions on Cuntz–Krieger algebras*, preprint, arXiv:1501.06965v4, to appear in Math. Z.

[15] K. Matsumoto, *Topological conjugacy of topological Markov shifts and Cuntz–Krieger algebras*, preprint, arXiv:1604.02763.

[16] P. S. Muhly, D. Pask and M. Tomforde, *Strong shift equivalence of C^*-correspondences*, Israel J. Math. **167** (2008), pp. 315–346.

[17] W. L. Paschke, *Inner product modules over B^*-algebras*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **182**(1973), pp. 443–468.

[18] I. Raeburn and D. P. Williams, *Morita equivalence and continuous-trace C^*-algebras*, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, vol(60) Amer. Math. Soc. (1998).

[19] M. A. Rieffel, *Induced representations of C^*-algebras*, Adv. in Math. **13**(1974), pp. 176–257.

[20] M. A. Rieffel, *Morita equivalence for C^*-algebras and W^*-algebras*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **5**(1974), pp. 51–96.

[21] M. Rørdam, *Classification of Cuntz-Krieger algebras*, K-theory **9**(1995), pp. 31–58.

[22] M. Tomforde, *Strong shift equivalence in the C^*-algebraic setting: graphs and C^*-correspondences*, Operator theory, Operator Algebras, and Applications, 221–230, Contemp. Math., **414**, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2006.

[23] Y. Watatani, *Index for C^*-algebras*, **424**(1990), Memoirs of Amer. Math. Soc.

[24] R. F. Williams, *Classification of subshifts of finite type*, Ann. Math. **98**(1973), pp. 120–153. erratum, Ann. Math. **99**(1974), pp. 380–381.